

Date: Tue, 5 Oct 93 18:04:31 PDT  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #1182  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Tue, 5 Oct 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 1182

Today's Topics:

                    Codeless Tech Debate  
            FCC Preempts .../IL and headsets  
            Flux Gate Sensor wanted  
            Hunter harrassment  
            New HF Rig  
    PA-QSO Party Special Event Station  
            RG-8/M questions? (3 msgs)  
            Understanding Antennas (2 msgs)  
            VE30NT final announcement

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 5 Oct 93 15:16:33 EDT  
From: psinntp!arrrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>Ah DX, well that's different. Morse encoded CW is marvelous for  
>"The Game". The standardized contacts don't require any real  
>communications thruput. A few seconds to beep out the callsigns,  
>ignore the rest since it never changes, and go on to the next  
>contact. I'm sure some people enjoy that, but pardon me if I'm  
>not impressed. To actually engage in an exchange of ideas usually  
>requires a bit more thruput than that, or extraordinary patience.

Well, I have found that my CW contacts are more meaningful than some of the ones I have seen described. I guess it all depends on what you put into it. This has even been true for many of my DX contacts, although I have not engaged many DX stations in hours-long ragchews. In the case of DX, many of the stations choose to do quick contacts, perhaps to help them in their awards chasing, or because their grasp of English is nearly as bad as our grasp of Bohemian. If the only words they know are RST, name and the Q signals, that is probably all they are going to use.

Nonetheless, I have managed to exchange quite a few ideas on CW with DX and stateside stations. I will probably get to do it again real soon, just as soon as I get my new station set up. I am still working on necessities such as repairs to my heating system (fixer-upper house).

>I find that 100 WPM RTTY is as slow as I care to communicate,  
>and much prefer the rapid exchanges of ideas available with voice.  
>It's a matter of taste, of course.

>Few of those contacts would  
>have been of interest if thruput was restricted to only a few words per  
>minute.

This is true at 13 WPM. At 40 wpm, with abbreviations and Q sigs, things can move remarkably close to voice speeds.

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed

-----

Ed Hare, KA1CV  
American Radio Relay League  
225 Main St.  
Newington, CT 06111  
(203) 666-1541 - voice  
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor  
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing

ehare@arrl.org

The opinions expressed in my posts do not necessarily represent League policy, but I can probably get in trouble for them anyway.

-----

-----

Date: 5 Oct 93 14:07:47 CDT  
From: timbuk.cray.com!hemlock.cray.com!cherry10!dadams@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: FCC Preempts .../IL and headsets  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article 3xo@cbnewst.cb.att.com, waco@cbnewst.cb.att.com (john.l.broughton) writes:

|In article <1993Sep30.103724.1@levy.fnal.gov> levy@levy.fnal.gov  
|(Mark E. Levy, ext. 8056) writes

| \*\*\* stuff deleted \*\*\*

|>Don't know about where you are, but in ILLinois headphones are OK as long as  
|>one ear is not covered. Assuming that both work (the ears, that is).  
|>

|Just to clarify this. Headphones covering only one ear are allowed while  
|driving in IL by hams ONLY if you have amateur license plates on your vehicle.  
|Not having memorized the statute, a copy of which I have in my car, I would  
|assume non-Illinois hams with callsign plates could legally use on-eared  
|headsets while driving in IL.

|Word of caution; it pays to have a copy of such statutes in case one gets  
|stopped by the police. One of our amateur club members is a ham and also a  
|lieutenant on a local city police department. He advised of the soundness of  
|having a copy of the legislation as there is no "formal" procedure for police  
|departments to be notified of all changes in the IL Vehicle Code. Sounds  
|kind of strange to me, but that's the way it is.

Wow, this is scary. I used to drive with a pair of walkman headphones  
to listen to tapes. I couldn't hear the radio with or without headphones--  
to much noise.

---

--David C. Adams Statistician Cray Research Inc. dadams@cray.com

Kilo Golf Zero India Oscar -(KG0IO)-

-----  
Date: 5 Oct 1993 21:50:38 GMT  
From: usenet@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Flux Gate Sensor wanted  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

For an application in Remote Sensing I am looking for an earth magnetic  
field detector / flux gate sensor (as used in aircraft) to determine attitude  
and compass direction of a buoy. How accurate are those gauges and where are  
they available?

I was told Precision Navigation, Inc. manufactures such devices,  
but I haven't been able to find the address. Does anybody know this company?

Thanks for any hints!

--

-----  
Stefan Waas  
Scripps Institution of Oceanography      E-Mail: swaas@ucsd.edu  
University of California San Diego      Work: (619) 534-8029  
Physical Oceanography Research Division Fax: (619) 534-8509  
La Jolla, CA 92093-0230, U.S.A.  
-----

-----  
Date: 5 Oct 93 19:46:17 GMT  
From: ogicse!hp-cv!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!srngenprp!donrm@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Hunter harrassment  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Derek Wills (oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu) wrote:

> KILL!! SQUASH!! QRZ THE FREQUENCY!! BANG!!

Holy Saint Hiram! What a contest operator! Watch out for this dude on the low end of 20!

Don K6LTS

-----  
Date: 3 Oct 93 17:11:33 GMT  
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: New HF Rig  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, epacyna@auratek.COM (Edward Pacyna) writes:

>In article <28quvp\$5ql@safety.ics.uci.edu>, turner@safety.ics.uci.edu (Clark Savage Turner) writes:

>> In <28qqbb\$91t@hpuerca.atl.hp.com> jab@hpuerca.atl.hp.com (Alan Barrow) writes:  
>> I DO believe that there are a lot of loyal Ten Tec guys out in Europe. I  
>> have seen some write that they like the Ten Tec stuff because the front  
>> ends are more bulletproof (for 40) than the latest, greatest Kewood, Icom and  
>> Yaesu radios. This says a LOT, since Europe has a lot of local b'cast there on  
>> 40, and the front end has to handle a lot of garbage.

>>

>Huh?

>

>Have you looked at the DR, IMD, Intercept specifications lately?

These specifications often aren't relevant to how well a radio works in Europe. They might be if they were measured over a wide variety of tone spacings. But, for single spacing of 20 or 100 kHz, you really don't get the information you need to know. An amateur bands only receiver with filters will often outperform a general coverage receiver with better DR/IMD/Intercept numbers, simply because the wider RF filters let too much stuff through, despite the seemingly better IMD/DR/intercept numbers.

What happens is that while each broadcast station may contribute only a milliwatt or two, if you add a hundred of them up, and consider that at various instants some will add in phase, you can get a real overload problem. A filter that cuts reduces the number of these really makes a difference. The ideal solution is a tracking filter--preferably one that doesn't add to the distortion problem. Very expensive (45 kilobuck) receivers can do this.

How wide the local oscillator (phase noise) is really important if you want to operate next to a broadcast station's frequency. A bad oscillator will widen the bandwidth of received signals in a way that can't be filtered out with even the best IF filter.

(I'm assuming of course that someone wouldn't intentionally make their local oscillator noisy in a predictable manner).

With a good receiver, there will actually be gaps or clear spots between broadcast stations where you can work amateur stations.

Finally, there is the issue of 2nd order intercept points, in addition to the third order intercept. 2nd order distortion isn't a problem with good RF filtering, but may be worth looking at when evaluating wideband receivers.

Zack Lau KH6CP/1

Internet: [zlau@arrl.org](mailto:zlau@arrl.org) "Working" on 24 GHz SSB/CW gear  
Operating Interests: 10 GHz CW/SSB/FM  
US Mail: c/o ARRL Lab 80/40/20 CW  
225 Main Street Station capability: QRP, 1.8 MHz to 10 GHz  
Newington CT 06111 modes: CW/SSB/FM/packet  
amtor/baudot  
Phone (if you really have to): 203-666-1541

-----

Date: Tue, 5 Oct 1993 17:50:50 GMT

From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!  
math.ohio-state.edu!pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!linac!att!att-out!cbfsb!cbnews!  
cbnewst!cbnewsm!gdo%aloft.att.com@network.  
Subject: PA-QSO Party Special Event Station  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

\* \* \* \* S P E C I A L E V E N T S T A T I O N \* \* \* \*  
\* \* \* \* ! ! ! T H I S W E E K E N D ! ! ! \* \* \* \*

The Carbon Amateur Radio Club will be hosting a special event station at the annual Carbon County (Pennsylvania) Fall Foliage Festival. In addition to celebrating the beautiful Autumn colors of the Pocono Mountains, this year marks the Sesquicentennial of Carbon County. It also happens to coincide with the PA QSO Party. Carbon County has been one of the elusive counties in the past so you county hunters can get lucky.

We will be operating all HF bands in addition to 2m FM on our 147.255 (+600TX) repeater and packet using the call WA3CGB (Carbon's Greatest Booster).

Our packet station will be accessible via the EPALAN node near Allentown, PA. Some packet routes from other areas are:

-----

Date: 5 Oct 93 15:44:38 GMT  
From: ogicse!hp-cv!sdd.hp.com!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!usenet.ucs.indiana.edu!  
master.cs.rose-hulman.edu!news@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: RG-8/M questions?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

> It seems like an ideal compromise between RG-8 and RG-58 for the VHF  
> bands.  
> However, I can't find a mention of this in the ARRL Antenna Book, nor  
> the ARRL Handbook. Does anybody have the exact attenuation factor, in  
> dB per 100 ft.? Does anybody have any real experience with this stuff?  
> Good, bad or indifferent?  
>  
> I also just noticed that its velocity factor is 78% as opposed to the  
> 66% for both RG-8 and RG-58. Is this meaningful on 2m transmission?  
=====

I wouldn't use RG-8M above 30 MHz. I used it on my R-5 antenna before I sold it.

73 de Jack, K9CUN

XX  
XX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX P A D D I N G XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
XX  
XX  
XX  
XX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX P A D D I N G

-----

Date: 5 Oct 93 15:45:03 GMT  
From: ogicse!hp-cv!sdd.hp.com!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!usenet.ucs.indiana.edu!  
master.cs.rose-hulman.edu!news@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: RG-8/M questions?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

> It seems like an ideal compromise between RG-8 and RG-58 for the VHF  
> bands.  
> However, I can't find a mention of this in the ARRL Antenna Book, nor  
> the ARRL Handbook. Does anybody have the exact attenuation factor, in  
> dB per 100 ft.? Does anybody have any real experience with this stuff?  
> Good, bad or indifferent?  
>  
> I also just noticed that its velocity factor is 78% as opposed to the  
> 66% for both RG-8 and RG-58. Is this meaningful on 2m transmission?  
=====

I wouldn't use RG-8M above 30 MHz. I used it on my R-5 antenna before I  
sold it.

73 de Jack, K9CUN

XX  
XX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX P A D D I N G  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
XX  
XX  
XX  
XX  
XX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX P A D D I N G

-----

Date: 5 Oct 93 15:44:11 GMT

From: ogicse!hp-cv!sdd.hp.com!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!usenet.ucs.indiana.edu!  
master.cs.rose-hulman.edu!news@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: RG-8/M questions?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

> It seems like an ideal compromise between RG-8 and RG-58 for the VHF  
bands.  
> However, I can't find a mention of this in the ARRL Antenna Book, nor  
> the ARRL Handbook. Does anybody have the exact antennuation factor, in  
> dB per 100 ft.? Does anybody have any real experience with this stuff?  
> Good, bad or indifferent?  
>  
> I also just noticed that its velocity factor is 78% as opposed to the  
> 66% for both RG-8 and RG-58. Is this meaningful on 2m transmission?  
=====

I wouldn't use RG-8M above 30 MHz. I used it on my R-5 antenna before I  
sold it.

73 de Jack, K9CUN

XX  
XX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX P A D D I N G XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
XX  
XX  
XX  
XX  
XX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX P A D D I N G  
XX  
XX  
XX  
XX  
XX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX P A D D I N G  
XX  
XX  
XX  
XXXXXX

-----

Date: 5 Oct 93 13:36:12 EDT  
From: psinnntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Understanding Antennas  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.shortwave, asplund@aludra.usc.edu (Information Missing) writes:



>Hello all,

>

>I have a couple of basic questions regarding antenna theory. I was reading

See "Antennas," by John Kraus, published by McGraw-Hill. If you can keep up with it, it will answer your questions better than any explanation that would fit on this newsgroup. The ARRL "Antenna Book" discusses  $1/4$ ,  $1/2$  and  $5/8$ -wavelength antennas.

Don't believe everything you read in an advertisement!

Good listening.

Jim

--

jkearman@arrl.org

-----

Date: Tue, 5 Oct 1993 20:02:01 GMT

From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!srigenprp!alanb@decwrl.dec.com

Subject: Understanding Antennas

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Information Missing (asplund@aludra.usc.edu) wrote:

: I have a couple of basic questions regarding antenna theory. I was reading  
: a book on the subject and, in a chapter about antenna performance,  
: lists a chart showing "theoretical table of antenna gain". In the chart  
: it shows a Half-Wave Dipole as having a 2.1 db gain over an isotropic  
: radiator. Similarly, a  $5/8$  wave has a theoretical 3.3 db gain over the  
: isotropic radiator.

It is difficult to compare the gain of any type of ground-plane antenna to an antenna in free space.

Any antenna over an (infinite) ground plane has an inherent 3 dB advantage over an antenna in free space, simply because the GP antenna only has to radiate power in half of space. A  $1/4$ -wave vertical over an infinite ground plane has 3 dB "gain" over a  $1/2$ -wave dipole in free space. If you place a vertical dipole some distance over an infinite ground plane, it will have 6 dB gain over the  $1/4$ -wave at some vertical angles and minus infinity gain at other angles.

To make this clearer, imagine a  $1/2$ -wave vertical dipole in free space. You could place an infinite ground plane between the two  $1/4$ -wave halves,

perpendicular to the wires, without any change in the field pattern or feedpoint characteristics (since it occupies a zero-potential plane in the dipole field.) It's easy to see that the dipole is now radiating 1/2 its power above the ground plane and 1/2 below. In effect, we now have two 1/4-wave verticals over ground plane, one pointing up and one pointing down. Each vertical is generating the same field strength (in it's half of the universe) as the dipole did, but with only 1/2 the power. Therefore each vertical over a ground plane has 3 dB "gain" over the dipole in free space.

In reality, most 1/4-wave "ground plane" antennas are not installed over anything like an infinite ground plane. Usually there are 3 or 4 1/4-wave radials at the base. You can think of such an antenna as a vertical dipole where the bottom half has been split into 3 or 4 wires and bent out at an angle. Compared to a vertical dipole at the same height, it will have about the same, or a little less, gain, depending on the angle of the radials with respect to the radiator. (The angle is often about 45 degrees, to give a good 50-ohm match.)

To answer your original question, a 5/8-wave vertical over a ground plane has about 3 dB gain over a 1/4-wave vertical over ground plane. What the gain is relative to "isotropic" or to a 1/2-wave dipole in free space is a matter of definition.

Now there's a complicated answer to a simple question!

AL N1AL

-----  
Date: 5 Oct 93 21:21:44 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: VE30NT final announcement  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

VE30NT EME Operation  
Final October Announcement

The Toronto VHF Society plans to use the 150' dish at the Algonquin Provincial Park this coming weekend, Oct. 9 & 10. Operation will be as follows:

Date (UTC)	VE30NT TX Freq	RX Freq	Approx. time (UTC)
Saturday, Oct. 9	432.050	432.050-060	0445-1830
Sunday, Oct. 10	144.029	144.025-030	0545-1915

The dish can be lowered to about 4-5 degrees elevation so there is a short period between Moonrise and first echos.

Operating suggestions:

Doppler shift will move the apparent VE30NT frequency a bit.. This will make VE30NT appear to be a little "off frequency," so tune around.

Approx. Doppler shift:	Moonrise	Moonset
432 MHz	+ 1.0 kHz	- 0.65 kHz
144 MHz	+ 0.34 kHz	- 0.23 kHz

Note that we will be operating "split"; please spread out. Also, please avoid duplicate QSOs.

VE30NT will be operating in the "work 'em as quickly as you can" mode most of the time. If conditions seem to be marginal, we will revert to sequenced operation, in which VE30NT transmits the first 30 seconds of each minute. Note that this 30-second sequencing will be rare. We will make every effort to work small and horizon-only stations.

We will make announcements concerning a planned November operation at a later date.

Michael Owen, W9IP

-----  
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 1993 16:40:41 GMT  
From: netcon!bongo!netcomsv!cds8604!NewsWatcher!user@locus.ucla.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <28asm8\$2g1@lester.appstate.edu>, <jdm-300993102247@158.140.20.177>,  
<CE7xI2.6pz@odin.corp.sgi.com>604  
Subject : Re: Best way to learn code?

In article <CE7xI2.6pz@odin.corp.sgi.com>, adams@chuck.dallas.sgi.com  
(Charles Adams) wrote:

> my qsl card is in the mail. i know we're going to work and i know what  
> your RST to me is, thus we have a valid QSO. :-)  
>  
> you DO QSL, don't you?  
>  
> tu es gl n test de k5fo dit dit  
>

> :-)  
>  
> name hr is chuck

I was wondering when you were going to get around to sending me your card.

A little late, don't you think?

Joe

--

Joe Mastroianni A.R.S. AA6YD		"Up the airy mountain,
jdm@cadence.com		Down the rushy glen,
74107,310:cserve		We daren't go a-hunting,
JOE-M:Genie		For fear of little men."
		- Allendale

-----  
The opinions expressed in this article do not reflect those of my employer  
-----

Date: 5 Oct 93 20:30:54 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!linac!att!cbnewsm!jeffj@network.ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Sep29.202111.22095@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
<28pmqv\$53n@news.acns.nwu.edu>, <1993Oct5.151123.16722@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject : Re: Codeless Tech Debate

In article <1993Oct5.151123.16722@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>In article <28pmqv\$53n@news.acns.nwu.edu> lapin@casbah.acns.nwu.edu (Gregory Lapin) writes:

>>

>>At my home QTH I've talked around the world with my dipole 20 feet up in  
>>the trees and with about 50 watts out. I have some great QSOs on CW.  
>>Nobody seems to hear me on SSB, where my meager signal is spread out over  
>>about 10 times the bandwidth. Now you suggest that I spread it out even  
>>further to run FM!

>

>Ah DX, well that's different. Morse encoded CW is marvelous for  
>"The Game". The standardized contacts don't require any real  
>communications thruput. A few seconds to beep out the callsigns,  
>ignore the rest since it never changes, and go on to the next  
>contact. I'm sure some people enjoy that, but pardon me if I'm  
>not impressed. To actually engage in an exchange of ideas usually  
>requires a bit more thruput than that, or extraordinary patience.

>I find that 100 WPM RTTY is as slow as I care to communicate,  
>and much prefer the rapid exchanges of ideas available with voice.  
>It's a matter of taste, of course.

As those of us that do CW can tell your ability on CW must be fairly limited. Most of the anti-CW hams who attack it seem to have this in common. A decent CW contact shares the same things as a SSB contact ie... name, RST and QTH. GASP! They share the same standardized format at the start of QSO! How can this be? Funny how the rest of QSO is different from the start. Then again, it's funny how a little skill can make for a enjoyable QSO on CW. I have chatted for over an our about G5RVs and other parts of ham radio on CW many times. Worked DX in exactly the same format as a SSB contact. Had friends build rigs from scratch for very little money and have a great time with CW at 1 watt. It's a major part of ham radio and no matter how much the the anti-CW types wish this wasn't true that's the way it is. 73!

Jeff

--

Jeff Jones AB6MB		OPPOSE THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT!
jeffj@seeker.mystic.com		Canada/USA Free Trade cost Canada 400,000 jobs.
Infolinc BBS 510-778-5929		Want to guess how many we'll lose to Mexico?

-----

Date: (null)

From: (null)

All contacted stations who send a #10 or bigger SASE to WA3CGB will receive an attractive QSL certificate suitable for framing or wrapping fish.

--

Glenn D. O'Donnell, N3BDA	Internet: gdo@aloft.att.com
AT&T Bell Laboratories	Packet: n3bda@n3dpu.#epa.pa.usa.na
Allentown, PA	Home QTH: Palmerton, PA

-----

Date: 5 Oct 93 23:34:29 GMT

From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <28f93b\$s0f@cville-srv.wam.umd.edu>, <wFTuac1w165w@nj8j.atl.ga.us>, <28rf9fINNIh9@network.ucsd.edu>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Motorola ad in QST?

In article <28rf9fINNIh9@network.ucsd.edu> brian@nothing.ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor)

writes:

>ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us (Ben Coleman) writes:

>>... My experience has been that many hams think

>>nothing about pirating software willy-nilly.

>

>I suspect you'll find that the public in general thinks nothing of

>making copies of software - 'piracy', as the people who theoretically

>stand to lose money by this practice term it.

>

>And although I make my living from software, I suspect that if Congress

>ever came to codify the will of the people in law, you'd find that

>making personal copies of software at no charge would become completely

>legal, since that's what the great majority of the public does.

Software piracy is a problem. Intellectual property rights should be observed. But the "theoretically" above is also right on. I'd suggest that most of the lost sales are pure fiction because people wouldn't buy the software at the publisher's price that they pirate.

Commercial piracy is a problem because if it weren't illegal to make copies, businesses would buy one copy of a software package and make enterprise wide copies. But how many individuals would buy a \$2,000 CAD package for home use? Any copying doesn't represent lost sales, it represents a larger trained user base who will support the product's purchase in their commercial life.

Borland showed the right way to fight piracy by having a reasonable price structure, including the documentation in a bound volume, and having a license agreement that doesn't ban copying, instead banning simultaneous use on multiple machines. "Like a book" licensing they call it. Few people photocopy entire books rather than buying them. Software produced and sold like books doesn't have a big piracy problem. Increasing use of CD-ROM distribution can reinforce this "like a book" philosophy.

There's a growing secondary market in software where used copies are sold. This violates the license agreement of most software, but it's done anyway by people who don't consider themselves pirates. That's because they treat software, "like a book".

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	"If 10% is good enough	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	for Jesus, it's good	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	enough for Uncle Sam."	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244	-Ray Stevens	

-----

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #1182

\*\*\*\*\*